UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,067	07/14/2003	Robert Douglas Christiansen	100204030-1	7123

22879   7590   06/02/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/620,067	CHRISTIANSEN, ROBERT DOUGLAS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	HILINA S. KASSA	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2008.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment submitted on 02/01/2008 has been acknowledged. Claims 1-22

are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10 and 17 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14, 16-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) in view of Neuhard

et al. (US Patent Number 6,052,198).

(1) regarding claim 1:

As described in figures 1-6, Schoenzeit et al. disclose a networked computing

environment (**column 4, lines 30-36, 47-56; note that a computer network**

configuration is illustrated) including a Raster Image Process (RIP) manager coupled

to at least one RIP engine (**42, 40a-40c, figure 3; column 5, lines 35-38; note that the**

graphic image server 14 manages the flow of graphic files and rasterized image

data), a method for the RIP manager to automatically configure the RIP engine

(**column 5, lines 53-64; note that the output devices include RIP in order to**

rasterize the print job based on the designated module without manual set up or

an operator), the method comprising:

receiving a print job (**column 5, lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the**

received job is a graphic image file which gets RIPed in order to be printed); and

the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine

RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-**

column 10, line 2).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except

for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of

at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP

manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP

engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the

RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference

(**152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job**

is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPed version is submitted or available

if not, the RIPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer).

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the

same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of

the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing

parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied

processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in

order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al.

to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

(2) regarding claim 2:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at

least one RIPing parameter is a RIPing algorithm, a resource/software version, a

particular font, or a color profile (**column 5, line 60-column 6, line1; note that**

software versions is considered).

(3) regarding claim 3:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of

first and second RIP engines in a pipeline (**54a, 54b, figure 3**)

wherein the first and second RIP engines are heterogeneous with respect to one

another (**column 7, lines 55-62**); and

wherein requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration is further

directed to configuring the first RIP engine to process the particular portion using same

RIPing parameters as used by the second RIP engine to RIP a different portion of the

print job (**column 7, lines 57-62; note that each RIP can process different portions**

of the image file).

(4) regarding claim 4:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises

downloading, by the RIP engine, any configuration resource(s) indicated by RIP

manager supplied processing preference(s) that are not locally available to the RIP

engine (**column 5, lines 20-24; note that different software gets either stored to a**

disc or transferred/loaded from host computer).

(5) regarding claim 6:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises:

directing the RIP engine to communicate a status to the RIP manager indicating

whether the RIP engine can perform the dynamic configuration in accordance with the

RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 6, lines 5-18; note that each**

file contained in the RIP queues and output include status identification); and

wherein the status determines whether the RIP engine or a different RIP engine

in the pipeline will RIP the particular portion (**column 6, lines 14-18**).

(6) regarding claim 7:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the status is a response message or a

lapse of time (**column 6, lines 5-18; note that for each status there is a message**).

(7) regarding claim 9:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises:

determining that the RIP engine can successfully RIP the print job in

accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 7, lines 55-**

59); and

responsive to the determining, communicating the particular portion to the RIP

engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference

(**column 7, lines 21-29**).

(8) regarding claim 10:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computer-readable medium having

computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring

a raster image processor (RIP) engine stored thereon (**column 5, lines 53-64; note**

that the output devices include RIP in order to rasterize the print job based on the

designated module without manual set up or an operator), the computer-program

instructions comprising instructions for:

evaluating a print job to identify a set of RIPing parameters (**column 5, lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the received job is a graphic image file which gets RIPed in order to be printed**);

communicating the RIPing parameters to a RIP engine to direct the RIP engine to automatically configure its RIPing operations to conform to the RIPing parameters (**column 6, lines 19-28**),

the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-column 10, line 2**).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPed version is submitted or available if not, the RIPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer**).

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing

parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied

processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in

order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al.

to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

(9) regarding claim 11 and 18:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the RIPing parameters indicate one or

more specific RIPing algorithms, font resources, color profiles, and/or software versions

(column 5, line 60-column 6, line1; note that software versions is considered).

(10) regarding claim 14:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions

further comprise instruction for directing the RIP engine to RIP at least a portion of a

print job using resource(s) associated with the RIPing parameters **(column 7, lines 55-

62)**.

(11) regarding claim 16:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a raster image processor (RIP) manager

computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-program

instructions recited in claim 10 **(column 4, lines 44-56; note that the RIP manger is**

considered as the graphic image server which graphic images got created by

personal computer and communicated).

(12) regarding claim 17:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computer-readable media comprising

computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring

a raster image processor (RIP) engine coupled to a RIP manager (**column 5, lines 53-**

64; note that the output devices include RIP in order to rasterize the print job

based on the designated module without manual set up or an operator), the

computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

receiving, by the RIP engine, a request to configure RIPing operations in

accordance with one or more parameters specified by the RIP manager (**column 5,**

lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the received job is a graphic image file

which gets RIPed in order to be printed); and

responsive to receiving the request, the RIP engine configuring RIPing

operations based on the one or more parameters (**column 6, lines 19-28**), and

the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine

RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-**

column 10, line 2).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except

for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of

at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP

manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP

engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the

RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference

(152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job

is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPed version is submitted or available

if not, the RIPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer).

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the

same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of

the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing

parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied

processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in

order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al.

to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

(13) regarding claim 22:

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computing device comprising the processor

coupled to the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17 **(column 4, lines 44-**

53).

5.   Claims 8, 12, 13, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) and Neuhard et al.

(US Patent Number 6,052,198) and further in view of Berry et al. (US Patent Number

6,707,563 B1).

(1) regarding claim 12:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as

described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the computer-program

instructions further comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing

parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters.

However, Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further

comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or

more default RIPing parameters (**column 14, lines 50-67; column 15, lines 1-5; note

that the black and white printing parameter is supplemented by color printing**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they

are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to comprise instruction for

supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing

parameters. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make

the method efficient (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

(2) regarding claim 13:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters; responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations.

However, Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for: receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters (**column 10, lines 16-24; note that the color verses black and white configuration is considered as the subset of parameters**); and responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations (**column 10, lines 25-31**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art receiving a download request from the

RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing

parameters; responsive to the download request, communicating resources

corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for

subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method

efficient (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Schoenzeit et al. , Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in

claim 13.

(3) regarding claims 8 and 15:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as

described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP

engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline, determining that the first RIP

engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters;

responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to

perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters; and communicating

a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular

portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine.

However, Berry et al. disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim

10, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a

pipeline (**column 10, lines 1-6**), and wherein the computer-program instructions further

comprise instructions for:

determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in
accordance with the RIPing parameters (**column 10, lines 11-16**);

responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine
to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters (**column 10,
lines 16-24**); and

communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for
RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine
(**column 10, lines 25-34; note that the engine arranges the color and black and
white configurations**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they
are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been
obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP
engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline, determining that the first RIP
engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters;
responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to
perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters; and communicating
a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular
portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine. The
suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method
efficient and reliable (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to
combine Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as
specified in claim 15.

(4) regarding claim 21:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address; and responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager.

Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address (**column 10, lines 11-16; note that when there is a problem configuring one or more parameters, the print engines are reconfigured to different engines depending on the need to print the job**); and

responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager (**column 10, lines 16-31; column 12, lines 24-32**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the

RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources

corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address; and

responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job

assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method

efficient and reliable (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as

specified in claim 21.

6.   Claims 5 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) and Neuhard et al. (US Patent

Number 6,052,198) further in view of Eisele (US Publication Number 2002/0109869

A1).

(1) regarding claims 5 and 19:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as

described above except for teaching wherein RIP engine downloads configuration

resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager.

However, Eisele discloses wherein RIP engine downloads configuration

resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager (**paragraph 3, lines

3-8**).

It is desirable to have the RIP engine download settings from a network. This is because it reliable and faster to use. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method as taught by Eisele, in which RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager, into the method of Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al., because such feature is faster and reliable to be used.

(2) regarding claim 20:

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching, wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine.

However, Eisele discloses wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine (**paragraph 29, lines 4-9**).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method as taught by Eisele, in which the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine, into the method of Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al., because such feature is easier to be utilized from the local engine than the network address.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see http://pari-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
May 22, 2008

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625